

gray area, which some choose, unfortunately, to use for political reasons. One such gray area, the issues that affect the end-of-life decisions, is not only difficult but personal.

In my State of Oregon we have struggled, debated, and agonized with this issue throughout the last decades. The end-of-life issue is a very complex one. With the advent of new medical technologies, it is becoming even more challenging. There are a wide range of moral and medical issues associated with end-of-life decisions, but none that require Federal interference. Yet Congress is being asked to pass legislation that would undermine a law passed and subsequently upheld not once but twice by a vote of the citizens of Oregon.

Now, our death with dignity legislation is still a work in progress, but the preliminary evidence suggests that this option may actually reduce the incidence of suicide. Rather than having a flood of people to our State to take advantage of the provisions of the law, it appears that individuals having the knowledge that they, their families, and their doctor can control this situation, gives them a sense of peace and contentment that enables many to move forward, enduring the pain and the difficulty without resorting to taking their own life. It may actually reduce the incidence of suicide.

As Americans struggle with these issues, mostly hidden from public view, it is important that we not have the personal tragedy, that agony, that frustration made more difficult by laws that ignore the range of legitimate medical choices.

There are some very serious technical problems with this legislation. It would interfere with the practice of medicine, of pharmacy, of pain management in ways that can have a profound effect on the rights that many in America take for granted. This is why a large number of medical professionals have come forward in opposition to this legislation.

This bill asks law enforcement agencies, not doctors, law enforcement agencies, to make, on a case-by-case basis, judgment as to whether a doctor intended a terminally-ill patient's death while trying to alleviate pain. Asking nonmedical personnel to determine a doctor's intent and subsequent causal connection is neither appropriate nor is it even practical. The threat of these investigations can have a chilling effect open the treatment of pain.

Now, at the same time, some medical boards can and have imposed sanctions on doctors, including in Oregon, for not treating pain aggressively enough. So here we have put physicians in an impossible situation: On one hand non-medical activities second-guessing them and being sanctioned; on the other hand for not being aggressive enough.

Today, doctors help deal with end-of-life decisions everywhere in America;

and, in some cases, I guaranty that every day in America there are the equivalent of physician-assisted suicides. In every State but Oregon people look the other way. Oregon stands out because we have at least attempted to provide a framework. If this misguided legislation were to be passed, ironically, Oregon, the only State with guidelines where we are trying to deal with it, would be subjected to extraordinary scrutiny. Elsewhere, people would continue to look the other way.

I strongly urge the defeat of this ironically termed Pain Relief Promotion Act before it undermines not only the will of the people of Oregon, but also before it damages the sanctity of the doctor-patient decision-making process and erodes quality end-of-life medical treatment.

REPUBLICANS HAVE ACCOMPLISHED A LOT BUT STILL NEED PRESIDENT'S HELP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, last week President Clinton in his press conference attacked the Republican Senators for their courageous stance against a poorly designed nuclear test ban treaty, a test ban treaty that was unverifiable. A lot of the nations had not signed it yet, and a lot of rogue nations never intend to comply with it. But, more importantly, during that press conference he posed a question, "What will happen if the Republicans stay in office?" I am here on the floor this morning, and I feel compelled to answer his question.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind the President of some of the past accomplishments of the Republican Party here in Congress, which unlike the ill-advised test ban treaty are actually good for America. If we can be judged by our past, a lot of good things for America will occur in the future if we stay in power. Let me just take a few moments to talk about what we have accomplished.

One of the first orders of business when we took over here in Congress was to declare that Congress would comply with all the laws and statutes which all Americans also have to comply with. We reduced the bloated size of committee staff here in Congress by one-third and added to that a ban on gifts from special interests here in Congress.

We reformed the bloated inefficient welfare system, which held captive many Americans who only wanted a better life for themselves and their families. We provided welfare-to-work incentives for both individuals and businesses. And the Republican-led Congress has succeeded in dropping the welfare rolls to the lowest level in history.

The majority here passed health insurance portability, guaranteeing

working Americans that if they switched jobs or if they lost their job they could continue with their current health coverage.

We reformed the Food and Drug Administration, giving people quicker access to life-saving drugs and medical devices and provided for better food quality.

The Republican controlled Congress got tough on criminals by enhancing penalties for sexual crimes against children, and established a Nationwide tracking system for sexual predators. We also enhanced punishment for drug-induced rape.

Education was enhanced by giving local districts more say in how the money that they had was spent on teaching their children.

We also provided tax relief and allowed for health insurance deductions for small businesses.

We developed medical savings accounts so Americans can better decide how to provide for their health care. We also protected elderly patients from being evicted from nursing homes.

The Republican majority strengthened our national defense by increasing pay and retirement benefits, long overdue for our military; enhancing health care for veterans; and providing for a military which this administration has grossly underfunded and, I believe, forsaken.

Let us not forget the budget. The Republicans passed the Balanced Budget Act and bound our appropriations bills to spending caps. Now, this is the first time in 30 years that this was done. The Congressional Budget Office last week released its monthly budget review and the Federal Government's on-budget accounts, which excludes Social Security, are running a \$1 billion surplus for the year. Again, Mr. Speaker this, is the first time in 30 years. The majority party in Congress are to be commended.

Now, this is probably not new to the average American family, who also has to balance their budget and make their payments without going into deficits every year.

It is interesting that when President Clinton pushed the largest tax increase in history and passed that on to the American public, incidently he got it passed here very narrowly, that same year he could not balance the budget when the Democrats were in control in Congress. The Republican majority passed a lockbox measure, which declared \$1.8 trillion of the Social Security surplus untouchable. But what is amazing is that the President refused to join with us in this budget process to protect this lockbox. He is proposing brand new spending at the same time we are trying to balance the budget and protect Social Security.

Now, the Democrats, when they were in control, when they were in control, spent \$837 billion of the Social Security money for new spending programs. Now

they claim they want to save it. I remind my colleagues we have to remember when the Democrats were in control they spent all the Social Security surplus. In fact, the last year they controlled Congress they spent over \$130 billion from the Social Security Trust Fund.

We are trying to do a great deal around here. We need the help of the President. We have stood for much needed legislation on welfare reform, better health care, better education, tougher criminal penalties, tax relief, a stronger defense, a balanced budget, and, lastly, Social Security protection for our seniors. So I believe, contrary to what the President said in the press conference, the Republicans have done an excellent job for Americans in trying to save this republic and bring accountability. I need to remind the President that great things will occur for the American people if Republicans stay in office.

And in the future, I think we can look for great things for all America, but I remind the President that we need his help too.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O of all the virtues that we desire, we pray, O gracious God, for a grateful heart for the gifts of life and the opportunities of each day. For a nation where we can live in liberty and freedom, for colleagues and friends who encourage us, for mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers who love us and forgive us, for the blessings of faith and the gifts of hope, we offer this prayer of gratitude and thanksgiving. In Your name, O God, we humbly pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 15, 1999.
Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 15, 1999 at 11:10 a.m.

That the Senate Agreed to conference report H.R. 2684; that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3036.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAH, Jr.,
Clerk of the House.

ORVILLE MAJORS DESERVES DEATH

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, Orville Majors was convicted for killing patients in an Indiana hospital. Majors is now also accused of killing another 130 patients in hospitals. And after all this, Majors got life in prison.

Think about it. Majors will get three square meals a day, television, free health care, activity in exercise rooms. Beam me up, Madam Speaker. Orville Majors should not be given life; Orville Majors should be given death. It is no wonder America continues to have 17,000 murders a year. The truth is, America tolerates murderers like Orville Majors.

I yield back the unheard screams of 136 American victims.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that she will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any rollcall votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 6 p.m. today.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3081

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3081.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

PATRIOT ACT

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 659) to authorize appropriations for the protection of Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields in Pennsylvania, to direct the National Park Service to conduct a special resource study of Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields, to authorize the Valley Forge Museum of the American Revolution at Valley Forge National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pennsylvania Battlefields Protection Act of 1999".

TITLE I—PAOLI AND BRANDYWINE BATTLEFIELDS

SEC. 101. PAOLI BATTLEFIELD PROTECTION.

(a) PAOLI BATTLEFIELD.—The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to provide funds to the borough of Malvern, Pennsylvania, for the acquisition of the area known as the "Paoli Battlefield", located in the borough of Malvern, Pennsylvania, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Paoli Battlefield" numbered 80,000 and dated April 1999 (referred to in this title as the "Paoli Battlefield"). The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall enter into a cooperative agreement with the borough of Malvern, Pennsylvania, for the management by the borough of the Paoli Battlefield. The Secretary may provide technical assistance to the borough of Malvern to assure the preservation and interpretation of the Paoli Battlefield's resources.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$1,250,000 to carry out this section. Such funds shall be expended in the ratio of one dollar of